UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,005	06/28/2001	Paul Guignard	273402002600	5873

25094 7590 02/11/2005

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
2000 University Avenue
E. Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER
SHAAWAT, MUSSA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/720,005	GUIGNARD, PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mussa A Shaawat	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Application # 09/720,005, filed on June 28, 2001. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 6 recites the term "txplanation", it appears to be a spelling error it should recite explanation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hon-Mei H. Chang, US Patent No. (5,263,126) referred to hereinafter as Chang.

As per claim 1, Chang teaches a computerized generic knowledge management system, comprising:

a multi-dimensional global space within computer memory defined by attributes, where each attribute defines a feature of the external world or the internal state of the system, or actions that can be taken to modify them, and each attribute is a dimension

of the global space (see col.2 lines 35-40, 54-63, col.8 lines 35-51, Fig.3 item # 33-34 input truth table=ITT becomes an attribute value table=AVT which is defined and inputted by the user, code truth table=CTT in the form of a two dimensional array of number which is type of knowledge base stored in the storage of a computer i.e. multi-dimensional global space within a computer memory defined by attributes where each attribute defines a feature of the external world or the internal state, each entry of the CTT is code value in the corresponding value in the ITT);

a source space, within the global space, made up of selected ones of the attributes to define a context, in which to state problems (see col.3 lines 1-6, 33-34, col.4 lines 32-43, Input truth Table includes attribute values inputted by the user corresponds to the source space of selected attributes);

a destination space, within the global space, made of selected ones of to the attributes to define a context in which to provide answers to problems stated in the source space (see col.4 lines 50-58, Code Truth table corresponds to destination space of selected attributes);

mappings between defined parts of the source space which each represent one or more stated problems, to defined parts of the destination space which each represent one or more answers expressing and embodying is knowledge supplied by experts appropriate to the respective problems stated in the part of the source space (see col.4 lines 54-67, when a value inputted in the Input Truth Table i.e. source space, by the user, a code value is associated i.e. mapped, to a value in the Code truth table i.e.

destination space, where the mapping process happens between knowledge base, attributes and truth tables).

As per claim 2, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1, where the defined parts of the source and destination spaces are points or regions (see col.3 lines 2-6, where attribute values of truth table corresponds to points or regions in the source or destination spaces).

As per claim 3, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1, where the destination space is also part of the source space (see col.4 lines 54-58, the entry of the Input Truth Table i.e. source space has the same column number and the same row number as the entry of the Code Truth table i.e. destination space).

As per claim 4, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1 where the two spaces overlap (see col.4 lines 62-64, where each entry of Input Truth table is associated i.e. overlapped, to a selected value from the Code Truth Table).

As per claim 5, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1, where the mapping processes are explanations or actions (see col.5 lines 25-50, where the reasoning process when mapping or associating values from the Input Truth table to the Code truth Table involves truth/false statements i.e. mappings are explanations or actions).

As per claim 6, Chang teaches a system according to claim 5, where explanation mappings are not calculated, they are stated (see col.5 lines 41-48, where an entry of a row of a Code Truth table is false then the row is defined as false i.e. explanation is stated).

As per claim 7, Chang teaches a system according to claim 6, where explanation mappings are associated with code, which enable the outcome to be displayed on a screen or printer (see col.11 lines 7-16, where the values of Input Truth table and Code truth Table are displayed).

As per claim 8, Chang teaches a system according to claim 5, where action mappings associate a situation in the source space to actions expressed in the destination space (see col.4 lines 59-67, where the input value i.e. situation, to the Input Truth Table is associated i.e. mapping, with a code value i.e. action, from the Code truth table).

As per claim 9, Chang teaches a system according to claim 8, where the destination space, is made of instructions to be carried out by agents (see col.3 lines 47-49, where Code Truth Table i.e. destination space, is reasoned automatically by an Automatic Interference Engine=AIE which is a computer program made of instructions that carries the reasoning of Code truth table i.e. agent).

As per claim 10, Chang teaches a system according to claim 8, where action mappings are specified by a function or module that can be calculated, using the values of the source attributes that define the situation as parameters (see col.4 lines 44-49).

As per claim 11, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1, where source and destination space editing sub-systems enables authorized users to define and modify the destination and source spaces or contexts (see col.3 lines 35-37, the attribute values=ATV is defined and inputted by the user).

As per claim 12, Chang teaches a system according to claim 1, where a mapping editing sub-system enables experts to define mappings, which embody knowledge (see col.8 lines 52-60, the entries to the Input Truth table which is knowledge base are defined by the user which will be mapped to code values of the Code Truth Table)

As per claim 13, Chang teaches a composite system comprising a collection of systems according to claim 1, in which the source contexts of the systems are united, the destination contexts of the systems are united and the mappings of the systems are united to form the composite (see col.3 lines where components a-e are united and are combined to form a knowledge based expert system i.e. components are united to form a composite).

As per claim 14, Chang teaches a data acquisition method for a computerized generic knowledge management system, comprising the steps of:

inspecting a problem that either has no answer or an answer, which is deemed to be inadequate, that is a problem for which there is no defined part of the source space (see col.1 line 56-col.2 line 10, where the problem is trying to solve bottleneck in a knowledge base expert systems);

specifying attributes, and if appropriate, explanations relevant to the problem; defining the solution to the problem (see col.2 lines 54-67, the use of attributes of Input Truth table and code values of the Code truth table instead of if-then statements present a solution to the problem of bottlenecks in a knowledge base system);

generalizing the source context to generalize the inquiry to a larger part of the source space; and saving the knowledge item generated (see col.2 lines 35-40).

As per claim 15, Chang teaches a method according to claim 14, where the solution is defined after the source context has been generalized (see col.2 lines 59-67, where all entries to the truth tables haven been examined by the automatic interference engine=AIE of the knowledge base system and a solution is presented to the bottleneck problem i.e. solution is defined after context have been generalized).

As per claim 16, Chang teaches a system according to claim 2, where the destination space is also part of the source space (see col.4 lines 54-58, the entry of the Input Truth Table i.e. source space has the same column number and the same row number as the entry of the Code Truth table i.e. destination space).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Elad et al. US Patent No. (5,195,172) system and method for representing and solving numeric and symbolic problems
- Grosser et al. US Patent No. (6,826,552) apparatus and method for a computer aided decision-making system.

Communication

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mussa A Shaawat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3785. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30am to 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean R Homere can be reached on (571) 272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mussa Shaawat
Patent Examiner
February 01, 2005